DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 476 SO 030 445

AUTHOR	Vandell, Kathy
TITLE	Restructuring Education: Getting Girls into America's Goals.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Univ. Women, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 90
NOTE	8p.; For related documents, see SO 030 446-447.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of University Women, Sales Office, 11722 Parklawn Drive, Rockville, MD 20852 ($1.00).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; Educational History; Education Work Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Futures (of Society); Minority Groups; *School Restructuring; *Sex Differences; Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

A consensus on the need for reform in U.S. education has been growing for some time. For the continuing debate to produce effective solutions, the needs of girls, particularly minority girls, must be attended to in this debate and incorporated into plans for restructuring the system. This issue brief presents an overview of the aspects of school restructuring that would affect most directly the educational experiences of girls in the context of the long history of school reform in the United States. A resource list, glossary, and action ideas are included. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326476

Restructuring Education: Getting Girls Into America's Goals

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
KATHY VANDELL
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 445

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

August 1990

Restructuring Education: Getting Girls Into America's Goals

THE GREAT DEBATE

The belief that American education is failing and needs radical rebuilding is widespread. Politicians, educators, and pundits offer two reasons for their condemnation of the education system. The level of general knowledge among U.S. students, as revealed by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and other tests, is already very low and may be dropping.[1] America's trade deficit and declining competitiveness, they assert, further "prove" that our students are less capable than those in other countries, reflecting our failure to adapt schooling to the needs of a post-industrial, information-based economy.

This scenario masks the fact that American education has *always* failed sizable segments of the population, particularly women and minorities. In an industrial economy, in which most jobs could be filled by workers with relatively low education levels, such failure generated no sense of national urgency. Now, demographic studies are showing that by the year 2000 the labor force will be 47 percent female and 26 percent minority. This suggests that reversing the decline in competitiveness will depend not only on educating all workers to a higher degree, but on closing the gaps in educational achievement between these groups and white male students.[2] Further, a child's educational achievement is closely linked to the level of education attained by her or his mother, making girls' schooling even more important for long-term

Joe DiDio, National Education Association

achievement gains.[3] Despite this, the reform reports of the early 1980s typically ignored the needs and school experiences of girls and women.[4]

The 1990s promise to be an important period in American education. At its outset, the decade already has been marked by growing consensus on the need for education reform *and* by continuing debate over how to do it. But for the solutions to be effective, the needs of girls—particularly minority girls—must be attended to in this debate and incorporated into plans for restructuring the system.

The American Association of University Women (AAUW), consistent with its tradition of promoting educational opportunity for women since 1881, is exerting every effort to bring the needs of women and girls to a central position in this dialogue. The Association's *Choices for Tomorrow's Women* initiative calls on its more than 135,000 members nationwide to work to bring down the institutional barriers that limit the educational and career choices of women and girls. The AAUW Educational Foundation's Eleanor Roosevelt Fund for Women and Girls funds research, teacher fellowships, and

Joe Difazio, National Education Association

community action addressing equity in education for girls and minorities. AAUW also plays a leading role in the National Coalition on Women and Girls in Education, a partnership of 50 advocacy organizations.

With this issue brief, AAUW presents an overview of the aspects of school restructuring that would affect most directly the educational experiences of girls—including minority girls—in the context of the long history of school reform in this country. A resources list, glossary, and action ideas are provided to facilitate the reader's involvement in the debate and advocacy of restructuring proposals that will enhance the educational achievement of girls and women.

FROM REFORM TO RESTRUCTURING

Education reform is as much an American pastime as is baseball. The first wave of school reform occurred in the early nineteenth century and created a common public school system to replace a patchwork of private schools. In the common school tradition, school is conceived as the crucible of Americanization, creating good citizens by conveying the nation's political and cultural unity through a shared curriculum. Equity is the theme pervading the rhetoric of the common school.

In the late nineteenth century, the common school concept was challenged by an alternative vision: to provide the work force for an industrial nation, schooling should be tailored to students' vocational needs. Thus, vocational schools for the trades, commercial high schools for non professional white-collar work, and academic high schools for college preparation were established. This view presents the school as a kind of factory, with efficiency as the pervasive theme.

The debate over these competing visions of the American school raged for 30 years before a compromise was struck in the early twentieth century: a common curriculum in the elementary grades, followed by a differentiated curriculum in a common, "comprehensive" high school. Although this compromise has held for 60 years, the successive waves of criticism directed against it have continued to polarize around its two constituent visions and metaphors of education. While efficiency concerns dominated the debates of the 1940s and 1950s, equity concerns dominated in the 1960s and 1970s.

The scenario of declining student achievement due to a decaying education system unable to adapt to a changing economy masks the fact that the educational system has always *failed sizable segments of the population.*

In the wake of *A Nation at Risk*, the National Commission on Excellence in Education's 1983 report, efficiency concerns—dressed up as aspirations to "excellence"—returned to the fore, with conservatives elaborating a vision of schools as instruments of the competitive marketplace.[5] This economic vision of schools resulted in proposals to regulate the inputs of production (e.g., competency tests for teachers, longer school days or years, a national core curriculum), improve the "market" for education (e.g., choice or voucher plans, decentralized decision making), and monitor the output of schools (e.g., competency tests for students, higher graduation requirements).[6] (For definitions of these and other terms to follow, see "The Jargon of Restructuring," p. 3.)

Now, in the early 1990s, a new consensus that rejects the idea that equity issues can be amputated from issues of efficiency or "excellence" is gradually emerging. This perspective recognizes that excellence and equity are interdependent goals, but the debate over how to achieve them still tends to polarize around those two metaphors. One of the most vital tasks in the decade just begun will be to continue to enlarge the common ground between these two positions to ensure that the needs of women and minorities are not sacrificed to false efficiency measures.

"Restructuring" is widely and often inaccurately used to describe two kinds of changes in the education system.[7] Certain reforms—holdovers from the early 1980s—show up persistently in the debate on restructuring education, but do not truly involve restructuring because they focus on fixing parts of the existing system. Of these reforms, the ones with the most vigor address school financing, accountability, and choice or voucher plans.

The narrowest and most precise use of "restructuring" in the current debate refers to changes in decision-making structures and in the lines of authority among state administrators, local boards, local administrators, and teachers. Such proposals involve site-based management, other modes of increasing local control, and community linkages.

Most of these restructuring proposals do not have a direct, differential impact on girls and minorities, but some adverse effects can be identified. To the extent that accountability measures rely on gender- and culture-biased standardized tests, girls' self-esteem and career planning will be compromised.[8] Girls and minorities also suffer when a test-driven curriculum is not equitable in terms of gender or cultural diversity. When choice plans lead to "super-tracking" and resegregation, minority and low-income girls suffer. Unchecked local control can squeeze out the voices of constituencies in the community that may not win representation on school councils or boards, such as women and minorities.

On the other hand, because most teachers are female, empowering teachers might provide a wider range of successful role models for girls; likewise, an increase in women administrators might provide a more "girl-friendly" school environment. The most promising aspect of restructuring for girls and minorities is the avenue the proposals open for the adaptation of curricula and instructional techniques to the needs, learning styles, and cultures of individual students and particular communities.

FOR WHOM THE SCHOOL BELL TOLLS

Gender, culture, and learning styles. More and more research is showing that children's school experiences are filtered through the cultures they bring to their educational experiences, including an array of learning styles grounded in the values, languages, and structures of their cultures. However, the curricula and instructional techniques in American schools tend to be tailored to the culture and learning style of only one group, white males.

"In the dominant U.S. culture, motivations of individualism are systematically favored over cooperation. The consequences for girls of this pattern in schools can be critical—it silences their voices and stifles their moral perspective."[25]

Perhaps the most important of our cultural communities—because it cuts across all ethnic groups and economic strata—is gender. Many researchers have suggested that prevailing patterns of gender-role socialization create what amounts to different cultures for females and males, and that these cultures mediate intellectual experience in ways that create different learning styles.[9]

Extensive research led by Carol Gilligan has identified two modes of moral and intellectual development that reflect gender differences.[10] One emphasizes caring for other people—focusing on solving moral dilemmas in ways that are acceptable, or at least not disruptive, to the people in the network of relationships affected by the solution. The other emphasizes applying abstract principles—focusing on solving moral dilemmas through the disinterested application of rules of right and wrong, regardless of their impact on the people affected by the decision. Although both women and men exhibit each of these moral orientations, women tend to cluster around the first mode and men around the second.

Partly as a result of these patterns, Gilligan and other researchers suggest, girls respond differently to the classroom environment than boys. For instance, girls tend to perform better than boys in cooperative work groups in which students work out ways of tackling problems together. Boys tend to respond better than girls when tasks are presented as competitions or games in which one must apply or work within a set of prescribed rules.[11]

Schools not only have failed to adapt to such differences, but have ignored or exacerbated them for more than 200 years. Countless studies have demonstrated that girls, in comparison with boys, receive less attention and less effective feedback from teachers and are more likely to be tracked into low-ability math and science groups. Further, teachers typically have lower expectations of girls and too often allow boys to dominate both class and small-group discussions and activities. Most curricula largely ignore both the realities of women's lives and the achievements of women. The results—lowered self-esteem, decreased independence, declining ambition, self-defeating career choices—are equally well-documented.[12]

Joe DiDio, National Education Association

In recent years, researchers have begun to look at the ways girls resist or accommodate school experiences that are maladaptive to their needs. These studies suggest that girls' interactions with their school systems depend partly on their community and class cultures. Jean Anyon found, for instance, that middle-class fifth-grade girls are more likely to resist gender stereotyping by striving to excel or adopting "tomboy" behaviors, while working-class girls are more likely to resist by withdrawing, distancing themselves from academic competition, and accommodating social expectations by adopting strongly traditional "feminine" behavior.[13]

Gilligan's most recent research, conducted among upper-class girls at a private school, suggests that those girls experience a clear "moment of resistance" around age 11, when they are supremely confident of their own insights and ideas, but that they lose this confidence by age 15 or 16. Since this period corresponds exactly to the ages when gaps in achievement tests appear between boys and girls, this research suggests that those gaps have more to do with accommodating social and educational expectations than with ability.[14]

Most American schools are doubly injurious to minority girls because they fail to adapt to most minority cultures and learning styles. For instance, inner-city children are more attuned to collaborative, interactive learning styles than to the individual competition emphasized in most schools. Native Hawaiian and some Native American cultures tend to employ a holistic cognitive style based on a cycle

THE JARGON OF RESTRUCTURING

Accountability reforms seek to develop objective measures of student achievement such as standardized tests. Critics point out that standardized tests are often gender- and culture-biased and that emphasis on such tests can result in narrow curricula geared to "teaching to the test."

Choice or voucher plans allow parents to choose their child's school by transferring state aid dollars or providing "vouchers" for a certain amount of tuition to the school of the parents' choosing. However, schools with declining enrollments find it hard to compete, given their shrinking budgets. Choice plans also can lead to **super-tracking**—the segregation of students into different schools based on ability or curriculum—as well as a return to racially segregated schools. For example, unless a school system provides full transportation for *any* student to travel to *any* school, it will tend to segregate on the basis of families' abilities to pay for transportation.

Community-center schools would be the hubs of community social services, with curricula grounded in hands-on service to their communities, and evening and weekend activities serving their constituents.

Culturally compatible education involves adapting both curricula and instructional methods to the cultures of the students served by each school. Education that is **gender-fair** is culturally compatible for girls.

Local control proposals involve placement of parents and community members on the planning body, typically a "school council," for a particular school. Unchecked local control can squeeze out the voices of constituencies in the community that may not win representation on school councils or boards, such as women and minorities.

School finance reforms would require states to find a more equitable way to distribute resources among school districts than through local property taxes. Property-tax-based funding discriminates against low-income districts, which are often minority-dominated.

Site-based management gives the power for hiring, resource allocation, curricular decisions, and scheduling to local schools, thus providing local administrators and teachers with more authority over the educational environment and resources. These plans emphasize teamwork, participatory decision making, and innovation in curricula and instruction.

of observation of adults, participation in adult activities, and coaching until mastery is attained. This contrasts with the passive reception and rote regurgitation of material that takes place in most American schools. Some researchers have begun to hypothesize that the academic success of certain European and Asian immigrant cultures is due largely to a "good match" between those cultures and a school system that rewards competition and individual achievement.[15]

Further, some minority communities may rightly view American public school curricula as irrelevant or hostile to their cultures.[16] When educators ignore the achievements of minority cultures and focus exclusively on indoctrinating students into the dominant culture, they validate the belief that the schools have little to offer these communities but blind assimilation. Thus, the so-called achievement gap between whites and minorities may reflect primarily the failure of the school system to adapt its curricula and instructional methods to these differences. One Native American nation, the Kickapoo, reversed a longstanding downward trend in student achievement scores when it adopted a new curriculum and instructional model that emphasized Kickapoo values and culture.[17]

Consensus on instructional change. Many of the changes in instructional techniques that have been recommended for teaching girls and minorities are also being touted as ways to boost all students' achievement. Too often, however, one or two recommendations are put forth indiscriminately as the key to such success when in fact the key is tailoring instructional techniques to the learning styles of the specific communities—and even the individual children—being served.[18]

"When schools show no attention to the issues that are important to [girls'] lives, students lose confidence and begin to believe that the school is rejecting them."[20]

Several techniques have been recommended to make learning more individualized. Teaching fewer subjects in more depth would allow for more individual coaching and an emphasis on mastery, instead of mere coverage of a subject. This would also allow schools to abandon tracking, and perhaps even grade-level groupings, in favor of mixed-ability and mixed-age classrooms where students would learn from one another as well as from the teacher. Ideally, individual learning plans would be implemented for each student. To achieve these goals, however, responses to our national education emergency will have to include a commitment to greater resources for education.

Further recommendations focus on limiting lectures and recitations and replacing them with interactive learning methods that develop critical thinking skills. "Coaching"—assisted performance through modeling, questioning, and dialogue—helps to develop problem-solving skills, as does collaborative learning. Interdisciplinary teaching that tackles real-world problems, especially when combined with hands-on projects, demonstrates the use and value of knowledge far better than the typical ingestion and regurgitation of "facts."

These instructional methods are similar to the teaching of everyday skills that take place in the home and community; their effectiveness is attested to by educators' laments that schools cannot undo what is learned in the home. Further, they foster an integrated curriculum that strengthens the link between students' schooling and their cultures.

Examples of such efforts can be found at all educational levels. One elementary school in St. Paul, Minnesota, integrated student involvement in planning and building a new playground into math, science, and social studies classes. The "sand committee" chair was a girl. An eighth-grade class in Cedar Falls, Iowa, used school computers to analyze the school district budget, determined that more money was allocated to athletic equipment for boys than to that for girls, and succeeded in petitioning the school board to equalize the spending. And in Ortonville, Minnesota, high school students used computers to determine whether farming families would be better off spending $100 on livestock feed or fertilizer. A 16-year-old girl won an award

Joe Dobbs, National Education Association

GETTING GIRLS INTO AMERICA'S GOALS

In February 1990, after extensive negotiations, the National Governors' Association and the Bush administration jointly issued the following National Education Goals. The National Coalition on Women and Girls in Education—of which the AAUW is a leader—responded to the goals in May 1990, pointing out the ways in which achieving them depends on attending to the needs of girls and women. Its report, "Education for All: Women and Girls Speak Out on the National Education Goals" is summarized here.

GOAL 1: By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn. Requires enhancing the ability of female-headed households to prepare children for school, including achievement of adequate living standards and access to parental leave, child care, Head Start funding, and adult female literacy programs.

GOAL 2: By the year 2000, we will increase the percentage of students graduating from high school to at least 90 percent. Requires addressing factors that have a particular impact on keeping girls in school, including provision of gender-fair curricula and instruction, pregnancy prevention programs, and assistance to pregnant and parenting teens.

GOAL 3: By the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy. Requires gender-fair curricula, teaching methods attentive to the learning styles of individual students, and methods of assessing competency that do not rely on standardized tests, which can contain race and sex biases.

GOAL 4: By the year 2000, U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement. Requires developing interventions at key junctures in girls' academic lives to increase their participation and success in these subjects.

GOAL 5: By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Requires gender-fair programs in vocational education and encouragement of the participation of women in employment and training programs including postsecondary training for technical and professional careers.

GOAL 6: By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning. Requires ensuring safety from sexual and racial harassment and assault in the schools.

for her extraordinary performance of the assignment.[19]

The new instructional methods adopted by each school should depend on the particular cultures and learning styles of the communities it serves. As adaptive plans are being made, advocates for girls must work to ensure that gender is never omitted from the equation.

Conflicts over curricula. Educators and policymakers agree that all schools need to implement more rigorous academic curricula. Defining a core curriculum that everyone can agree to is relatively simple in math and science, but consensus dissolves when the same issue is raised with regard to history, literature, and the social sciences. Critics of curricula in these disciplines divide into two camps: roughly speaking, those who favor a narrow, nationally defined "common core" of knowledge and those who promote a broad yet locally defined pluralistic curriculum.

Proponents of the former believe that such a core imparts the "cultural literacy"—E.D. Hirsch's term—necessary to sustain political discourse and promote economic efficiency. They blame declining student achievement on the so-called dilution of the traditional curriculum with courses on women and minorities.[20] Their core is defined by the "classics" of that traditional curriculum, which focus almost exclusively on the achievements of white males of European descent. Despairing teachers, faced with students who cannot, for instance, place the Civil War in the correct century, are often highly attracted to this proposal.[21]

Critics of "cultural literacy" proposals charge that its basic premises are false. An examination of several high school textbooks convinced one researcher that there already is a national curriculum: the texts included nearly all the items on Hirsch's cultural literacy list of "what every American ought to know."[22] Widespread failure to learn this curriculum, which is largely uninformed by a diversity of experiences and perspectives, merely reflects its irrelevance to most students' cultures and lives. In fact, refusal to learn the traditional curriculum may be a form of resistance by girls and minorities.

Even more insidious is the notion that because white men have succeeded by studying this curriculum, it is the *only* formula for academic and occupational success. The traditional curriculum was developed between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries when schooling was limited to male elites, and it focuses on the achievements and cultures of people like those students. The fact that white males excel in this curriculum may reflect the potency of grounding the curriculum in a student's own culture and not the superiority of its content.

Culturally compatible education. Making education culturally compatible means adapting both curricula and instructional methods to the cultures of the students served by each school. According to this model, successful classrooms are those that attend to the needs of the cultures represented in their communities. Accommodation to the mainstream culture, including competence in the mainstream language, without total assimilation and loss of cultural identity, is the goal. Education that is "gender-fair" is culturally compatible for girls.

Culturally compatible—and gender-fair—education requires[23]

- a variety of instructional methods designed to work with the learning styles of the cultures served by each school and classroom.
- an interactive form of pedagogy in which all students participate to provide multiple viewpoints and one that validates our pluralistic, multicultural society.
- educators who can teach students to be competent in the mainstream culture *and* appreciative of cultural diversity, including gender differences.
- literature, history, and social studies curricula that reflect the pluralistic and multicultural context of American society, and show women and minorities as doers, leaders, and decision-makers rather than as helpers and victims.
- curricula that reflect a core of common themes providing cultural unity but do not entail teaching the same material to every student regardless of her or his cultural background.
- curricula that prepare girls *and* boys for work in the family sphere and in the paid labor force.
- equal access to resources, including role models and equitable teacher expectations.
- pluralistic standards for student development and learning styles.

Zebbie Bradley-Bondurant will use her AAUW Eleanor Roosevelt Teacher Fellowship to monitor student achievement and teaching habits in the classroom to produce a long-range study of girls' classroom experiences in science.

MAKING IT HAPPEN

Advocates for girls and women must work to ensure that the school restructuring to occur in the 1990s and the early twenty-first century attends to the needs of girls, and particularly minority girls. This means both enriching the body of knowledge about girls' educational experiences and insisting that policymakers use what we already know to make schools work for girls. Effective action will include

- sponsoring and conducting research about how women and girls think, learn, work, and play; how diversity and cross-

RESOURCES

AAUW issue briefs relating to elementary and secondary education are available from the AAUW Sales Office (see bottom of page 6).

- "College Admissions Tests: Opportunities or Roadblocks?" (June 1988)
- "Coping with Teen Pregnancy: Community Strategies" (July 1988)
- "Vocational Education Equity in the Making?" (December 1988)
- "Equitable Treatment of Girls and Boys in the Classroom" (June 1989)

The AAUW Educational Foundation's Eleanor Roosevelt Fund for Women and Girls funds original research on educational equity, as well as **Eleanor Roosevelt Teacher Fellowships.** The fellowships, which support the work of teachers seeking to advance gender equity in the classroom, increase the effectiveness of math and science instruction for girls, and meet the needs of minority students and students at-risk of dropping out, carry stipends of $1,000 to $10,000. Female elementary and secondary teachers who have at least five consecutive years of full-time teaching experience are eligible. Application materials are available from the Eleanor Roosevelt Fund for Women and Girls, AAUW Educational Foundation, 1111 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

"Education for All: Women and Girls Speak Out on the National Education Goals" reviews the goals issued jointly by the National Governors' Association and the Bush administration in February 1988 and points out how the needs of girls and women must be attended to in order to achieve those goals. Please send a check ($4 per copy) payable to AAUW to the AAUW Program and Policy Department, 1111 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

The following publications are available from the National Association of State Boards of Education, 1012 Cameron Street, Alexandria, VA 22314; 703/684-4000.

- ***Today's Children, Tomorrow's Survival*** is a concise review of various restructuring proposals and state actions needed to foster restructuring ($6, includes postage and handling).
- ***Taking Action: State Strategies for At-Risk Girls*** discusses strategies for keeping at-risk girls in school and fostering their academic achievement (forthcoming in fall 1990).

Joe DiDio, National Education Association

cultural communication relate to school experiences; and how to eliminate barriers to educational participation for girls and minorities. The AAUW Educational Foundation's Eleanor Roosevelt Fund for Women and Girls, established in 1988, has embarked upon an ambitious program of such activities, including sponsored research, teacher fellowships, and community action grants. Teachers newly empowered under restructuring initiatives can draw on this research and fund-

As the Business Roundtable asserts, "to prepare the American work force of the next century, we must recognize and draw on the strength to be found in the diversity of American society."[27]

ing to help restructure their schools to help girls and minorities succeed. (See "Resources," p. 5.)

- keeping the needs of girls in a central position in policy debates. The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, of which AAUW is a leader, has provided a model for such action in "Education for All: Women and Girls Speak Out on the National Education Goals." The report analyzes the impact on girls of the National Education Goals issued jointly in early 1990 by the Bush administration and the National Governors' Association and suggests what must be added to the goals to serve girls' educational needs.[24] (See "Getting Girls Into America's Goals," p. 4). As state and local education agencies and schools plan for restructuring, advocates for girls and women should draw upon this model to put—and keep—girls in the picture.
- AAUW branches' and divisions' continued application of their members' lobbying skills, network of contacts, and other resources to the debate on restructuring and planning at the local and state levels.
- teachers', parents', school board members', and community members' advocacy for girls in education planning processes at the local and state levels.

UNITY IN PLURALISM

As we move into the twenty-first century, a consensus is emerging on the need to develop approaches to instruction, curricular planning, and school governance that draw on the strengths of the individuals and communities served by each school.

Such agreement bears the promise of educational success for all of America's children, a reversal of the decline in our nation's economic competitiveness, and the invigoration of our citizens' flagging political involvement. Its basis in—and celebration of—strength in diversity is a new approach to an old problem, that of educating a heterogeneous population for participation in a democratic country striving for an egalitarian society. If this consensus is to be genuine and profound, and if this promise is to be realized, the solutions to our educational problems must address the needs of girls and minorities.

FOOTNOTES

1. "More than Half of Students in Survey Flunk History and Literature Test," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 11, 1989, p. A15.
2. Howard N. Fullerton, Jr., "New Labor Force Projections, Spanning 1988 to 2000," *Monthly Labor Review* (November 1989), pp. 3–12.
3. Arleen Leibowitz, "Parental Inputs and Children's Achievement," *American Journal of Human Resources* 12 (1977), p. 242.
4. Mary Kaye Tetrault and Patricia Schmuck, "Equity, Educational Reform, and Gender," *Issues in Education* 3 (1985), pp. 45–67.
5. National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983).
6. See Larry Cuban, "Why Do Some Reforms Persist?" *Educational Administration Quarterly* 24 (August 1988), pp. 329–35.
7. Lynn Olson, "The Restructuring Puzzle," *Education Week*, November 2, 1988, pp. 7–11; Michael Cohen, "Restructuring the System," *Society* 26 (May–June 1989), pp. 46–48.
8. "College Admissions Tests: Opportunities or Roadblocks," American Association of University Women (AAUW) issue brief (June 1990).
9. Patrick C. Lee and Nancy B. Gropper, "Sex-Role Culture and Educational Practice," *Harvard Educational Review* 44 (1974), pp. 369–407; Sharon Chamrin Nash, "Sex role as a Mediator of Intellectual Functioning," in Michele Anderson Wittig and Anne C. Petersen, eds., *Sex-Related Differences in Cognitive Functioning* (New York: Academic Press, 1979), pp. 263–302.
10. Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).
11. Ibid.
12. "Equitable Treatment of Girls and Boys in the Classroom," AAUW issue brief (June 1989).
13. Jean Anyon, "Intersection of Gender and Class: Accommodation and Resistance by Working Class and Affluent Females to Contradictory Sex Role Ideologies," in Stephen Walker and Len Barton, eds., *Gender, Class and Education* (New York: Falmer Press, 1983), pp. 19–37.
14. Carol Gilligan, Nona P. Lyons, Trudy J. Hanmer, eds., *Making Connections: The Relational Worlds of Adolescent Girls at Emma Willard School* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), pp. 6–29.
15. M. Sandra Reeves, "Self Interest and Common Weal: Focusing on the Bottom Half," *Education Week*, April 27, 1988, pp. 19–21; Roland Tharp, "Psychocultural Variables and Constants," *American Psychologist* 44 (February 1989), pp. 349–59.
16. Tharp, op. cit., p. 349.
17. Victor Dupuis and Margery W. Walker, "The Circle of Learning at Kickapoo," *Journal of American Indian Education* 28 (October 1988), pp. 27–33.
18. See Ronald Rothman, "What to Teach: Reform Turns Finally to the Essential Question," *Education Week*, May 17, 1989, pp. 1, 8–11; Roland Tharp and Ronald Gallimore, "Rousing Schools to Life," *American Educator* 13 (Summer 1989), pp. 20–25, 46–52; Cohen, op. cit.
19. Joe Nathan, "Toward a Vision of Students as 'Citizens,'" *Education Week*, April 25, 1990, p. 32; Joe Nathan, *Micro-Myths: Exploring the Limits of Learning with Computers* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985), p. 115.
20. E.D. Hirsch, *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).
21. See Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, "Schooling, Culture, and Literacy in an Age of Broken Dreams," *Harvard Educational Review* (May 1986), pp. 172–94.
22. James Hoetker, "Re-Hirsching Some Questions about Curriculum," *Clearing House* 62 (March 1989), pp. 319–23.
23. See Asa Hilliard, "Teachers and Cultural Styles in a Pluralistic Society," *NEA Today* (January 1989); Mary Kaye Tetrault, "The Journey from Male-Defined to Gender-Balanced Education," *Theory Into Practice* 25 (1986), pp. 227–34; Chanel Shakeshaft, "A Gender at Risk," *Phi Delta Kappan* (March 1986), pp. 499–501; Tharp, op. cit.; Lee and Gropper, op. cit.
24. See National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE), "Education for All: Women and Girls Speak Out on the National Education Goals" (Washington, DC: NCWGE, 1990).
25. National Association of State Boards of Education, "Taking Action: State Strategies for At-Risk Girls," manuscript (forthcoming fall 1990), p. 4.
26. Ibid., p. 5.
27. The Business Roundtable, "The Education Decade: A Business Commitment to America's Children," *Youth Policy* (February 1990), p. 28.

American Association of University Women
1111 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

AAUW promotes equity for women, education and self-development over the life span, and positive societal change.

The AAUW Educational Foundation provides funds to advance education, research, and self-development for women and to foster equity and positive societal change.

AAUW's Legal Advocacy Fund provides funding and a support system for women seeking judicial redress for sex discrimination.

Sharon Schuster, President, AAUW

Alice McKee, President, AAUW Educational Foundation

Gretchen Ilgenfritz, President, AAUW Legal Advocacy Fund

Anne L. Bryant, Ed.D., Executive Director

This brief was prepared by Kathy Vandell, Research Associate, Program and Policy Department, and Lauren Fishbein, Senior Editor, Communications Department, with special thanks to Janice Earle, Director, Center on Education Equity, National Association of State Boards of Education. Copies of all AAUW issue briefs are available from the AAUW Sales Office, 11722 Parklawn Drive, Rockville, MD 20852 ($1 per copy, $7 minimum order).

In principle and in practice, AAUW values and seeks a diverse membership. There shall be no barriers to full participation in this organization on the basis of race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin or disability. Membership is not by invitation.

© 1990, American Association of University Women

8581 10M

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991